

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 01 2009

Serial No. 10/551,468
Docket No. 2582LN.ah

6

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Submitted herewith is a Replacement Drawing Sheet for Figure 2. Please replace the drawing sheet for Figure 2 which was originally filed with the Application with the Replacement Drawing Sheet submitted herewith.

In particular, Figure 2 has been amended to address the Examiner's objection to the drawings and to clearly identify the brackets 19 and 20 and the intermediate section 21.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 01 2009

Serial No. 10/551,468
Docket No. 2582LN.eh

7

REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment is proper because it narrows the issues on appeal and does not require further searching by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 3-11 and 19-20 and 22-24 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 1-11 have been amended to more particularly define the claimed invention. Claims 2 and 21 have been canceled.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 19 and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being allegedly indefinite. Applicant submits that claims 19, 20 and 22 have been amended and claim 21 has been canceled to address the Examiner's concerns. Therefore, these claims are clear and not indefinite, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Claims 1-2, 9-11 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Roberts et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,231,711).

Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Smith (U. S. Pat. No. 3,322,291).

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roberts in view of Smith.

Claims 3, 5 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roberts in view of Morain (U. S. Patent No. 3,260,390).

Claims 3-5, 9-11 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roberts in view of Magnusson et al. (U. S. Patent No. 3,664,531).

Claims 6, 19 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roberts and Magnusson and further in view of Smith.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Roberts and Magnusson and further in view of Morain.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the following discussion.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 01 2009

Serial No. 10/551,468
Docket No. 2582LN.eh

8

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

An exemplary aspect of the claimed invention (e.g., as defined by claim 1) is directed to an apparatus for laying a material sheet on a plurality of cylindrical bodies, including a unit for applying a material web to the cylindrical bodies, and a conveyor disposed to advance the cylindrical bodies in a longitudinal direction thereof, to, past and away from the unit. The conveyor includes a first section including a plurality of wheels for rotating and advancing the cylindrical bodies, the first section being disposed to displace the cylindrical bodies in their longitudinal direction and connecting a cylindrical body of the plurality of cylindrical bodies with an end of a preceding cylindrical body of the plurality of cylindrical bodies, and a second section including a plurality of wheels for rotating and advancing the cylindrical bodies, the second section being connected to the first section and operating independent of the first section, and being disposed to positively rotate the cylindrical bodies about their longitudinal axis and displace the cylindrical bodies in the direction of their longitudinal axis during the applying of the material web, with a desired spacing between edges of the applied material web,

Importantly, the first section displaces the bodies ahead of the unit for applying the material web to connect the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body and permits slipping of the bodies after the connection of the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body (Application at Figures 1 and 2; page 5, line 31 to page 6, line 31).

II. THE ALLEGED PRIOR ART REFERENCES**A. Roberts**

The Examiner alleges that Roberts teaches the claimed invention of claims 1-2 and 9-11 and 20. Applicant would submit, however, that Roberts does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

In particular, nowhere does Roberts teach or suggest "*wherein said first section displaces the bodies ahead of the unit for applying the material web to connect the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body and permits slipping of the bodies after the connection of the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body*", as recited in claim 1 (Application at Figures 1 and 2; page 5, line 31 to page 6, line 31).

Serial No. 10/551,468
Docket No. 2582LN.eh

9

Clearly, Roberts does not teach or suggest these novel features.

Indeed, Roberts simply discloses sections of a mandrel which do not displace the cylindrical bodies in their longitudinal direction and do not rotate the tube. That is, even assuming (*arguendo*) that the sections of the mandrel may allow for axial and rotational movement of the tube, an axial movement of the tubes is made by the mandrel 19 and axial and rotational movement is made by a separate planetary drive assembly 39 (Roberts at Figure 4).

Further, a person skilled in the art would not seriously consider Roberts, since the necessity of the mandrel 19 would make the apparatus very complex and would allow only cylindrical bodies of one diameter.

The Examiner attempts to equate the mandrel sections 20, 21 and 22 with the first section of the claimed invention. This is completely unreasonable.

In fact, Roberts teaches simply that the mandrel 18 "supports the tubes 10 during the spiral wrapping of both the bonding film and fabric onto the tubes" (Roberts at col. 5, lines 1-2). That is, nowhere does Roberts teach or suggest that the mandrel sections 20, 21 and 22 include a plurality of wheels for rotating and advancing a plurality of cylindrical bodies. Further, nowhere does Roberts teach or suggest that the mandrel sections 20, 21 and 22 displace the bodies ahead of the unit for applying the material web to connect the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body and permits slipping of the bodies after the connection of the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body.

Therefore, Applicant would submit that Roberts clearly does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

B Smith

The Examiner alleges that Smith teaches the claimed invention of claims 1-3 and 5-6, and that Robert would have been combined with Smith to form the invention of claim 2. Applicant submits, however, that these alleged references would not have been combined and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

In particular, Applicant submits that these alleged references are completely unrelated.

Serial No. 10/551,468
Docket No. 2582LN.eh

10

and no person of ordinary skill in the art would have considered combining these disparate references, absent impermissible hindsight. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that these disparate references would not have been combined by one of ordinary skill in the art.

In particular, nowhere does Smith teach or suggest "*wherein said first section displaces the bodies ahead of the unit for applying the material web to connect the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body and permits slipping of the bodies after the connection of the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body*", as recited in claim 1 (Application at Figures 1 and 2; page 5, line 31 to page 6, line 31).

Clearly, Smith does not teach or suggest these novel features.

Indeed, Smith simply discloses a pipe handling conveyor 28 which includes a base 30 including a pair of side rails 32 (Smith at col. 2, lines 60-64).

The Examiner attempts to equate the support units 38, rollers 204, drive units 34 and rollers 63 with the first section of the claimed invention. This is completely unreasonable.

Indeed, nowhere does Smith teach or suggest that any of these features displace the bodies ahead of the unit for applying the material web to connect the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body and permit slipping of the bodies after the connection of the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body.

Therefore, Smith clearly does not make up for the deficiencies of Roberts.

Therefore, Applicant would submit that these alleged references would not have been combined and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

C. Morain and Magnusson

The Examiner alleges that Roberts would have been combined with Morain to form the invention of claims 3, 5 and 9-11, with Magnusson to form the invention of claims 3-5, 9-11, and 21-23 and with Magnusson and Smith to form the invention of claim 6, 19 and 24, and with Magnusson and Morain to form the invention of claims 7 and 8. Applicant submits, however, that these alleged references would not have been combined and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Serial No. 10/551,468
Docket No. 2582LN.eh

11

In particular, Applicant submits that these alleged references are completely unrelated, and no person of ordinary skill in the art would have considered combining these disparate references, absent impermissible hindsight. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that these disparate references would not have been combined by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Moreover, neither Roberts, nor Smith, nor Morain, nor Magnusson, nor any alleged combination thereof teach or suggest *"wherein said first section displaces the bodies ahead of the unit for applying the material web to connect the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body and permits slipping of the bodies after the connection of the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body"*, as recited in claim 1 (Application at Figures 1 and 2; page 5, line 31 to page 6, line 31).

Clearly, Morain does not teach or suggest these novel features.

Indeed, Morain simply discloses a pipe conveyor for wrapping machines. The conveyor includes continuous shafts 17 and shafts 13 (Morain at col. 2, lines 2-25; Figure 2). However, nowhere in col. 2 or Figure 2 or anywhere else does Morain teach or suggest a first section which displaces the bodies ahead of the unit for applying the material web to connect the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body and permit slipping of the bodies after the connection of the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body, as in the claimed invention.

Likewise, Magnusson does not teach or suggest these features.

In fact, Magnusson simply discloses a device for imparting a rotational and longitudinal movement to tubes. The device includes a shaft 3, pulleys or rollers 6, and pulley belt 4 (Magnusson at col. 1, lines 33-56).

However, nowhere does Magnusson teach or suggest a first section which displaces the bodies ahead of the unit for applying the material web to connect the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body and permit slipping of the bodies after the connection of the cylindrical body to the end of the preceding cylindrical body, as in the claimed invention.

Therefore, neither Morain, nor Magnusson make up for the deficiencies in Roberts.

In short, nowhere does the prior art teach or suggest an apparatus having a conveyor with at least two sections independent of each other so that it will be possible to control the spacing between the edges the applied material web. In an exemplary aspect, the first section,

Serial No. 10/551,468
Docket No. 2582LN.eh

12

for example, may include six pairs of conveyor wheels 11,12 permitting adjustment and regulation of the speed with which the sleeves are moved in axial direction and the second section includes six conveyor wheel pairs 23,24 being independent of the six pairs 11,12 in the first section. This may allow for adjustment of the speed with which the sleeves in axial direction after or during application of the web material and thereby adjustment of the spacing between the edges of the material web. Increased speed may increase the spacing and vice versa.

Therefore, Applicant would submit that these alleged references would not have been combined and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

Applicant notes that Figure 2 has been amended to address the Examiner's objection to the drawings.

Applicant notes that claim 1 has been amended to address the Examiner's objection thereto.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3-11 and 19-24, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

Serial No. 10/551,468
Docket No. 2582LN.eh

13

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,



Date: June 1, 2009

Phillip E. Miller, Esq.
Registration No. 46,060

McGinn IP Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the foregoing was filed by facsimile with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Examiner Christopher T. Schatz, Group Art Unit # 1791 at fax number (571) 273-8300 this 14th day of June, 2009.



Phillip E. Miller
Reg. No. 46,060